

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 1—38 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 39—45 are currently amended.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Centralized Network Usage Tracking

As disclosed by the Applicant, "Method and System for Centralized Network Usage Tracking" includes a number of aspects. In one implementation, a network server receives a request for content. For example, a client computer requests a webpage from the network server. The network server responds to the client with the requested webpage, wherein the webpage includes embedded therein a tracking tag. The tracking tag includes information about data requested by the client and sent by the server, and includes a request to a logging server for content. In the course of rendering the webpage on the client computer, the client computer encounters the tracking tag and therefore sends the request to the logging server. The logging server examines the request, which has embedded therein information about the content sent by the network server to the client. The logging server logs this information. The logging server then sends trivial information to the client computer that does not perceptibly slow the rendering process on the client computer. Accordingly, the logging server is able to log information on the content/data sent by a number of network servers to a number of clients.

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

Traversal of the §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 23 and 25—45 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,619, hereinafter "Allard." In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In particular, the Patent Office rejected claims 1—7 in a detailed manner. Claims 8—15, 17—23, 26—28, 30—33, 35—37 and 39—45 were rejected collectively, with the Office Action citing the reasoning behind the rejection of claims 1—7.

The rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 17, 26, 30, 35 and 39 will therefore be addressed simultaneously, using claims 17, 26, 30 and 39 as representative of this group. A review of (original) claims 17, 26, 30 and (currently amended) claim 39 is seen below:

Claim 17 recites a method, implemented in a logging server, comprising:

- receiving a request for content, the request having been submitted so that access to a web page on another server could be logged;
- logging information embedded in the request; and
- responding to the request with the content.

Claim 26 recites a method comprising:

- sending a request to access a web page at a first server;
- receiving the web page including an indication of additional content to be obtained from a second server so that access to the web page can be logged at the second server; and
- sending another request to the second server for the additional content.

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

1 **Claim 30** recites A method of tracking web usage, the method comprising:

- 2 • adding, to each of a plurality of web pages, a reference to content
3 stored at a central logging server; and
4 • logging, at the central logging server, information embedded in the
5 reference, wherein the central logging server is accessed by a remote
6 device to obtain the content when any of the plurality of web pages
7 is rendered.

8 **Claim 39** has been amended to recite a method for centralized network
9 usage tracking, comprising:

- 10 • configuring a webpage to include a tracking tag, wherein the
11 tracking tag comprises information about transmission of the
12 webpage from a server to a client, and wherein the tracking tag is
13 configured to appear to the client as a link to content to be
14 downloaded;
15 • transmitting, in response to a request by the client, the webpage
16 including the tracking tag from the server to the client;
17 • rendering the webpage on the client, wherein the rendering
18 comprises requesting delivery, by a logging server, of the content
19 identified by the link in the tracking tag; and
20 • receiving the tracking tag at the logging server and logging data
21 included within the tracking tag.

22 Several of the claims recite:

23 "configuring a webpage to include a tracking tag," (claim 39) or

24 "the web page including an indication ... so that access to the web page can
25 be logged at the second server," (claim 26) or

"adding, to each of a plurality of web pages, a reference to content stored at
a central logging server," (claim 30).

or similar.

The Allard reference does not disclose the use of tracking tags to track the
distribution of webpages from servers to clients.

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

1 The Patent Office points out that Allard discloses that HTML code may
2 reference images and other objects (col. 1, lines 60—65) that could be linked to
3 text transmitted with a webpage. Particularly, request by the client of a primary
4 object could result in transmission of secondary objects as well (col. 12, lines 47
5 53). Thus, Allard discloses that requesting a webpage may result in delivery of
6 content that directs the client, during the rendering process, to request other
7 content (e.g. images) from other servers.

8 However, Allard does not disclose "tracking tags" or a "web page including
9 an indication ... so that access to the web page can be logged." Instead, Allard
10 discloses webpages having links within primary objects to secondary objects.
11 However, these links are not configured to facilitate tracking, and do not track
12 webpage traffic. Additionally, Allard teaches 'handshaking' between server and
13 client (col. 5, lines 50—55) which establishes that the client will begin to track the
14 clients usage. Having established this status, there is no need for Allard to 'tag'
15 webpages with tracking-related data. Therefore, Allard tracks content access by
16 having the client track requested data at reference designator 48 or in the case of a
17 non-tracking client, the client 42 receives content from a tracking proxy 40, which
18 tracks the data to 44 (see, e.g., FIG. 2 and col. 6, lines 45—65).

19 Thus, Allard does not disclose the addition of anything, such as a tracking
20 tag, to webpages to facilitate tracking. Accordingly, this aspect, recited by the
21 Applicant's claims, is not shown or suggested by Allard. Therefore, the Applicant
22 respectfully requests that the Office remove the rejection of claims 1, 8, 17, 26, 30,
23 35 and 39.
24
25

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

Several of the claims recite:

"receiving the tracking tag at the logging server and logging data included within the tracking tag," (claim 39) or
"logging, at the central logging server, information embedded in the reference," (claim 30) or
"logging information embedded in the request," (claim 17).
or similar.

The Allard reference teaches "client side usage tracking of information server systems." (Allard, title.) As such, the tracking information is stored on the client (at 38, 48 in FIG. 2), and then is later moved to the server 22, for storage at 26 and 30 (see FIG. 2 and col. 9, lines 49—53). Thus, the client (or proxy server) logs the data, which can be consolidated at the server 22 (FIG. 2).

The Patent Office suggests that the proxy server corresponds to the Applicant's recited logging server (see OA mailed 04/01/2005, page 5, 7.b.).

However, the operation of the proxy server is different from the operation of the logging server, as recited in the Applicant's various claims. Referring to Allard, col. 10, lines 38—42, we learn that:

"...the tracking proxy server 40 knows of every request made by the non-tracking client 42. Therefore, such requests may be tracked by the tracking proxy server 40 and a session usage log for each non-tracking client may be stored on a disk 44."

Thus, the tracking proxy server 40 does not receive "the tracking tag" (claim 39) since the tracking proxy server logs data based on requests made by the client. In contrast, Allard does not disclose logging information that has been

S/N 09/704.196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

1 *embedded in the client's requests.* Because Allard does not log information
2 *embedded in the request (e.g. the tracking tag)* Allard does not disclose a means
3 *for the logging server (proxy server in Allard) to log information on content sent*
4 *to the client by servers other than, or unrelated to, the proxy server.*

5 Similarly, the tracking proxy server 40 is not involved in "logging, at the
6 central logging server, information embedded in the reference," (claim 30) since it
7 does not use information *embedded in the reference.*

8 Further, the tracking proxy server 40 is not involved in "logging
9 information embedded in the request" (claim 17) since it does not utilize any type
10 of information embedded in a reference when logging the data. Instead, the
11 tracking proxy server knows every request made by the client (col. 10, line 39) and
12 is therefore able to log the requests (col. 10, lines 40—42). Thus, the tracking
13 server does not log information "*embedded in the request.*"

14 Thus, Allard does not disclose all of the elements recited by the claims.
15 Accordingly, the section 102 rejection is improper, and the Applicant respectfully
16 requests that it be withdrawn.

17 Several of the claims recite "receiving a request for content, *the request*
18 *having been submitted so that access to a web page on another server could be*
19 *logged,*" (claim 17), or similar. In one example of such a request for content
20 submitted to result in data logging (and not for actual receipt of the content
21 requested), claim 39, as amended, recites a tracking tag, "wherein the tracking tag
22 comprises information about transmission of the webpage from a server to a
23 client."
24
25

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

1 The Patent Office suggests that Allard shows the elements recited.
2 However, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

3 The Applicant believes that Allard fails to disclose elements recited in the
4 claims. For example, the Allard reference fails to disclose a request for content
5 that is sent and/or received so that "access to a webpage on another server could
6 be logged," as recited by claim 17. Nothing in Allard would support the
7 contention that *requests for content are used for logging a record of content*
8 *access*. More particularly, Allard does not move tracking information as tags
9 embedded within a request for content. Instead, Allard allows the client to send
10 the tracking information to the server after the session has completed (col. 10,
11 lines 53—59). Thus, requests "for content, the request having been submitted
12 so that access to a web page on another server could be logged" (claim 17) are
13 unknown to Allard, who has a different system that never submits requests for
14 content "so that access to a web page on another server could be logged." Instead,
15 Allard sends the data in another manner (col. 10, lines 53—55).

16 Claims 2—7, 9—16, 18—25, 27—29, 31—34, 36—38 and 40—45
17 depend from claims 1, 8, 17, 26, 30, 35 and 39, and are allowable due to their
18 dependence from an allowable base claim. Additionally, these claims are also
19 allowable for their own recited features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in
20 references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.
21
22
23
24
25

LEE & HAYES, P.C.

S/N 09/704,196

Response to Office Action Dated 04/01/2005

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8-31-2005By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES P.L.L.C.
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

LEE & HAYES, PLLC